



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

negligence, caused incidental annoyance and damage to the adjacent property of the plaintiff. *Held*, that such operation constitutes neither a nuisance, nor an appropriation of property without just compensation. *Roman Catholic Church of St. Anthony of Padua v. Pennsylvania R. Co.*, 207 Fed. 897 (C. C. A.).

The cases have held that incidental annoyance to property owners, such as noise, jarring, smoke, and cinders, must, within certain limits, be suffered in the interests of the general public. *Carroll v. Wisconsin Central Co.*, 40 Minn. 168; *Beseman v. Pennsylvania R. Co.*, 50 N. J. L. 235, 13 Atl. 164. But this justification obviously fails where the act complained of is without legislative sanction. *Jones v. Festiniog Ry. Co.*, L. R. 3 Q. B. 733; *Pennsylvania R. Co. v. Angel*, 41 N. J. Eq. 316, 7 Atl. 432. This defense is likewise unavailing where the road has been run negligently, for the interests of the public at large do not demand that a community be subjected to unnecessary inconvenience. *Bunting v. Pennsylvania R. Co.*, 189 Fed. 551. The annoyance in the principal case not being within these exceptions, there arises the further question whether requiring the property owners to undergo damage to their land is taking without just compensation contrary to the federal Constitution. The construction of an elevated railroad so as to interfere with a property owner's enjoyment of light and air from a public street has been held to be such a taking. *Story v. New York Elevated R. Co.*, 90 N. Y. 122; *Aldis v. Union Elevated R. Co.*, 203 Ill. 567, 68 N. E. 95; see 17 HARV. L. REV. 201. No such question, however, is involved in the principal case, since the railroad was running on its own property, and there is no easement of light and air as to private land in this country. *Rogers v. Sawin*, 10 Gray (Mass.) 376; *Parker v. Foote*, 19 Wend. (N. Y.) 309. Nor can causing consequential damage, as here, be considered a taking. *Smith v. Corporation of Washington*, 20 How. (U. S.) 135. See *Heiss v. Milwaukee & Lake Winnebago R. Co.*, 69 Wis. 555, 558, 34 N. W. 916, 917; *Garrett v. Lake Roland Elevated R. Co.*, 79 Md. 277, 280, 29 Atl. 830, 831. But see 19 HARV. L. REV. 127. Again, such annoyance as that in the principal case is not inconsistent with any right of the plaintiff, who must be regarded as owning subject to such users and burdens of the public as the courts may determine are reasonably necessary.

OFFER AND ACCEPTANCE — REWARD — UNILATERAL CONTRACTS. — A reward was offered by the defendant for the arrest of a criminal. A police officer made the arrest, but the prisoner broke away from him and in the pursuit surrendered to the plaintiff. The defendant voluntarily paid the reward to the officer. The plaintiff now sues, claiming that although not acting in concert with the officer he is entitled to share in the reward as having aided in the arrest. *Held*, that the plaintiff is not entitled to any part of the reward. *Stair v. Heska Amone Congregation*, 159 S. W. 840 (Tenn.).

This case is noteworthy as a well-reasoned decision on a point on which satisfactory authority is conspicuously missing. The court gives an admirable statement of the law where the question is whether a reward should be divided between several persons: ". . . his right to so share in the reward depends upon there having been concert of action between him and Policeman Johnson when the endeavor was entered upon. Where there is no such concert as to joint efforts, he alone is entitled to the reward who first substantially complies with the terms of the offer." See a discussion of the same question in 27 HARV. L. REV. 185.

PLEDGES — EFFECT OF AGREEMENT TO PLEDGE FUTURE PROPERTY. — A farm lease contained the provision that all crops grown on the land should remain in the possession of the lessor until the rent payments had been satisfied. The lessee entered and raised a crop of small grain, which he sold and delivered to the defendant with notice of the stipulation in the lease. The rent not having